



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/189,365	11/09/1998	NIELS GEBAUER	33012/253/10	5433

7590 01/02/2002

CHARLES A JOHNSON
UNISYS CORPORATION
P O BOX 64942
MS 4772
ST PAUL, MN 55164

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14-6

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/189,365

Applicant(s)
Gebauer et al.

Examiner
Greta Robinson

Art Unit
2177



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 16, 2001

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 15 is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on Jul 9, 2001 is: ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2177

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.
2. Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 19 have been amended.
3. ***Cool Ice User's Guide Release 1.0*** was cited as prior art in the last office action paper number five.

Drawings

4. The corrected or substitute drawings (i.e. red line drawings showing changes to be made) were received on July 9, 2001. These drawings are approved; but figure 6 fails to show the proper lead lines with labels note objection below.
5. The drawings are objected to because figure 6 contains an extra lead without a reference label and leads for elements 152, 148, 140 and 160 are confusing with respect to the proper element that should be noted. See MPEP 37 CFR 1.84 (q) and 37 CFR 1.84(r). Correction is required. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this office action.
6. New formal drawings are required in this application because the formal drawing received on October 16, 2001 fails to comply with the Draftspersons requested changes noted on PTO

Art Unit: 2177

form 948 attached to paper number 3 mailed October 24, 2000. Note the new PTO form 948 attached to this paper.

Specification

7. The substitute specification with marked-up copy are approved by the Examiner for entry.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. Claims 16-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 16, the following claim language is vague: "*means responsively coupled to said offering means for preventing said offering means from said offering data processing services to said user in response to said service request unless said user-id corresponds to a security profile wherein said security profile permits access to said data table and **permitting access to access to said data table** if said user-id corresponds to said security profile*". The wording is awkward. Claims 17-20 are rejected based on dependency.

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.

Art Unit: 2177

Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 11 and 15 of copending Application No. 09/189,160. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is well settled that omission of elements and their functioning is obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. See *In re Karlson* 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

With respect to claim 1, a data processing environment having a user terminal with a user-id for generating a service request for access to a data table responsively coupled to a data base management system having a database containing a first data table and containing a second data table, the improvement comprising:

a security profile corresponding to said user-id whereby said data base management system permits said user terminal to access said first data table if and only if said security profile

Art Unit: 2177

corresponds to access to said first data table and prohibits access to said second data table if said user-id does not correspond to said second data table [see: **claim 1** of copending application no. 09/189,160]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to substitute the limitation of a *command language script* in case 09/189,160 claim 1 line 4 for the *user-id* of the present invention because the security profile provides access, identifies and encrypts the user-id through use of a command language script. Both claims contain a database management system having a data base for access to data; the distinction being that the present invention further states that the database of the database management system includes a first and second data table.

11. With respect to claim 6:

- a. a user terminal having a user-id;
- b. a database management system having access to a data base with a plurality of data tables responsively coupled to said user terminal; and
- c. a security profile located within said data base management system corresponding to said user-id wherein said data base management system provides access to a particular first one of said plurality of data tables of said data base by said user terminal if and only if said user-id corresponds to said security profile and prohibiting access to a particular second one of said plurality of data tables of said data base by said data base by said user terminal if said user-id does not correspond to said second one of said plurality of data tables [see claim 6, application no. 09/189,160]. It would have been obvious to substitute the data base management system of app.

Art Unit: 2177

09/189,160 for the plurality of data tables since both are essentially the same; that is the plurality of data tables (present application) are equivalent to the plurality of data bases (application 09/189, 160).

12. With respect to claim 11, transmitting a service request ... receiving said service request ... determining a security profile corresponding to said service request; comparing said security profile with said user-id; and responding to said service request if and only if said user-id corresponds to said security profile [see claim 11, 09/189,160].

13. With respect to claim 16:

- a. Means having a user-id for permitting a user to interact with a data table of a digital data base having a plurality of data tables using a service request;
- b. Means responsively coupled to said permitting means for offering data processing services involving access to said data table to said user in response to said service request; and
- c. Means responsively coupled to said offering means from said offering data processing services to said user in response to said service request unless said user-id corresponds to a security profile wherein said security profile permits access to said data table ... [see claim 16, application no. 09/189,160 the claim 15; both claims are directed to access to a database based on the user-id corresponding to the security profile].

Art Unit: 2177

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith US Patent 4,956,769.

With respect to claim 1, **Smith** teaches in a data processing environment having a user terminal with a user-id for generating a service request for access to a first data table [col. 1 line 57 through col. 2 line 2] responsively coupled to a data base management system having at least one database with at least one data table wherein said at least one data table includes said first data table, the improvement comprising:

a security profile corresponding to said user-id whereby said data base management system permits said user terminal to access said first data table if and only if said security profile corresponds to access to said first data table [see: col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

Smith teaches the invention substantially as cited above, they teach a data processing environment in which different levels of security may be programmed into the system for access.

Art Unit: 2177

16. With respect to claims 2-4:

(Claim 2) wherein said security profile corresponds to said first data table and does not correspond to access of said second data tables [note I/O operations for access to first and second tables may be defined see col. 2 lines 3-17].

(Claim 3) further comprising a second user terminal with a second user-id for generating a second service request for accessing said second data table wherein said second user terminal is prohibited from accessing said first data table [note rules for specific groups may be defined see col. 2 lines 18-25 and col. 3 line 62 through col. 4 line 68].

(Claim 4) further comprising a third user terminal with a third user-id for generating a third service request for accessing said first data table and said second data table wherein said third user-id corresponds to a third security profile for accessing both of said first data table and said second data table [note col. 2 lines 18-25].

17. With respect to claim 6:

- a. a user terminal having a user-id [col. 1 line 58 through col. 2 line 2];
- b. a database management system having access to a data base with a plurality of data tables responsively coupled to said user terminal [col. 2 lines 3-10; abstract]; and
- c. a security profile located within said data base management system corresponding to said user-id wherein said data base management system provides access to a particular one of said plurality of data tables of said data base by said user terminal if and only if said user-id

Art Unit: 2177

corresponds to said security profile [col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

18. With respect to claims 7-10:

(Claim 7) wherein said user terminal causes said data base management system to communicate with said data table by transferring a service request to said data base management system ... (Claim 8) wherein said data base management system communicates with said data base using particular command language script ... (claim 9) wherein said service request corresponds to said particular command language script ... (claim 10) said security profile corresponds to said particular command language script [figures 1 and 2; also some type of command language script is necessary for I/O interfacing].

19. With respect to claim 11:

transmitting a service request ... receiving said service request ... determining a security profile corresponding to said service request; comparing said security profile with said user-id; and responding to said service request if and only if said user-id corresponds to said security profile [col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

20. The limitations of claims 12-14 have been addressed above in claims 7-10 therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2177

21. With respect to claim 16:

- a. means having a user-id for permitting a user to interact with a data table of a digital data base having a plurality of data tables using a service request;
- b. means responsively coupled to said permitting means for offering data processing services involving access to said data table to said user in response to said service request;
- c. means responsively coupled to said offering means from said offering data processing services to said user in response to said service request unless said user-id corresponds to a security profile wherein said security profile permits access to said data table [col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

Allowable Subject Matter

22. Claims 5 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

23. In the remarks Applicant argued the following: (1) The double patenting rejection is provisional noting amendments to both applications; and a terminal disclaimer can be sent at a latter time after the case has been allowed.

Art Unit: 2177

In response to Applicant's argument, both applications pertain to security profiling which grants and prohibits access to a data base. The notion of a "table by table" basis for access in the present application is encompassed in application 09/189,160 limitation of access to the database. The database includes a table. Note updated citations.

(2) The security facilities of COOL ICE release 1.0 operate upon permitting or preventing operation of specific service requests without regard to the actual data to be accessed; whereas the present invention permits or limits access to specific data without regard to the actual operation to be performed.

In response to Applicant's arguments, this feature "limits access to specific data without regard to the actual operation to be performed" does not appear to be in the claim. However a new citation is made citing Smith who shows access to specific tables in a database which may be defined by the administrator. A security profile is taught for shared access to tables note citations supra.

24. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2177

Kobayashi et al. US Patent 6,275,825

26 Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta Robinson whose telephone number is (703)308-7565. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If any attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached at (703)305-9790.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2177

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)746-7238, (for formal communications)

Or:

(703)746-5657, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9600.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Greta Robinson', with a stylized, cursive script.

Greta Robinson

December 21, 2001